

REMARKS

Claim 12 has been canceled. Claims 11, 22 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 11 and 13 to 25 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this Response.

Drawings

A drawing has been requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit herewith Fig. 1. Since a Drawing has been added, the Specification has also been amended to include reference to same. No new matter has been added to the Drawings or the Specification. Acceptance of the Drawing and amendments to the Specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 22 and 25 were objected to for having a misspelled word. Applicants have amended both claims 22 and 25 so that “producible” is spelled correctly as “producible.” No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 22 and 25 is respectfully requested.

Priority Document

Because this application is a U.S. national stage application, the certified English translation of the priority document is already of record and should have been transmitted to the U.S. Patent Office by WIPO, as per Applicants’ request and authorization.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 22 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,909,705 to Lee et al. (“Lee reference”).

The Lee reference was available in printed form when it issued on June 21, 2005. Accordingly, the Lee reference cannot serve as a §102(b) reference against the claims of the present application which have a U.S. filing date of April 11, 2006. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and respectfully request its removal.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11 to 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054578 A1 to Zhang et al. (“Zhang reference”).

The Lee reference appears to concern integrating a Bluetooth network, i.e., a wireless local loop network, with a cellular network “so that the two networks can interoperate with devices enabled for both types of networks.”

The Zhang reference appears to concern a cross-layer architecture for “delivering multiple media streams over 3G W-CDMA channels in adaptive multimedia wireless networks.” The Zhang reference refers to a resource management mechanism allocating resources among different media streams, and such allocation is performed based on a minimum-distortion or minimum power criterion.

In contrast, claim 11 is directed to a method for exchanging data using a wireless connection, and requires providing a user with at least one portable terminal located in a transmission and reception range of at least one network; logging on automatically to establish a connection to the at least one network by the at least one portable terminal; and monitoring a movement of the at least one portable terminal across a boundary of the at least one network, wherein if the movement is to another network, another connection is established to the another network, and wherein for the data exchange, the transmission channel is adapted automatically to a type of the at least one portable terminal and a type of data to be transmitted, by an administrator to be assigned to the network.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, appear to teach or describe providing a transmission channel available for the exchanging data within a framework of the connection established; and monitoring a movement of the at least one portable terminal across a boundary of the at least one network, wherein if the movement is to another network, another connection is established to the another network, in the framework of the invention described in claim 11.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the references are not combinable as one reference concerns itself with Bluetooth device connectivity and the other reference concerns itself with multiple media streams over 3G.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Lee and Zhang references in combination or alone do not teach or describe all of the features of claim 11. Allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested. Since the remaining rejected claims either depend from or recite features analogous to those of claim 11, those claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Lee reference in view of the Zhang reference.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that any outstanding objections and/or rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 103(a), of claim 11 to 25 have been

overcome, and that those claims are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections and objections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 4, 2009

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200